

Editor
News-Post
Frederick, Md. 21701

12/30/85

Dear Editor,

Despite his efforts to appear to be more balanced in reaction to the strong criticisms of his earlier anti-semitic propaganda in his "Victims" column (12/30/85) ~~in all~~ ^{of} his misrepresentations (which include his own writing), his irrelevancies, his factual inaccuracies and his pseudo-scholarship Ray Meacham remains an anti-semitic propagandist and you continue to be his vehicle for this monstrous indecency.

Basic in this is his custo^mary resort to the Hitlerian big lie- the only reason there is no peace in the middle East is the alleged and implied Israeli refusal to agree to any peace. The plain and simple ~~Israeli~~ truth is that from before the state of Israel was established all the Arab states ⁺ ~~opened~~ and started wars and along with the Palestinian Arabs led by the Grand Mufti, who had spent World War II working in Berlin for Hitler, refused any kind of peace. They had the policy of driving all Jews into the sea and they adhere to it, with the exception of Egypt, which under Sadat did sign a peace and he then was assassinated by Arabs for it. Hussein is King of Jordan only because Abdullah, installed by the British, was ^K ~~taking~~ peace to the Israelis. And once the grandfather of all modern Arab terrorists, Arafat, indicated that under some conditions he would talk to the Israelis his cohorts threatened to assassinate him, too. All Arab rulers live in fear of Arab terrorists, who are those who want to eliminate the State of Israel and the Jews with it. *This terrorism is successful.*

There is, for example, the Camp David agreement. Israel has lived up to it. But *among* ~~Arabs~~ only Sadat agreed to it and he did not survive Arab terrorists as a result. There is no peace in the middle east ^{only} because those for whom "Meacham propagandizes want no peace, save at their terms, which the civilized world cannot accept.

By rewriting this history and ignoring all the actual reasons there is no peace Meacham misleads and misinforms your readers: "There could have been a comprehensive peace in the Middle East by now; this entire year all the involved parties concurred on that single point," only, ~~in~~ his rewriting, "nations, groups and individuals diddled over details while innocent men, women and children died." ~~He said~~ "Died?" Like in his version, there was only the "deaths" of "Israelis" in Cyprus?" They weren't killed in cold blood by those Meacham defends?) I repeat, the only reason there is not now and hasn't been peace in that area is not for the propaganda "Meacham uses your space to present but because anti-semitic Arabs have prevented it.

Meacham adds to his previous incitations to anti-semitism the exclamation that "Washington must hear" the small Israeli minority he exaggerates, who are ~~sure~~ weary of Arab assassinations and their costs and would agree to any kind of peace

in the futile ~~hope~~^{type} that it would satisfy the assassins. (Meachum's recollection of history doesn't include Munich.) What can he mean by this, other than the end of American assistance to Israel, the only dependable ally this country has in that area?

Imagine what would have happened to Meachum if he had said this during the Civil War! Would he have dared say that Washington must hear the Copperheads?

Meachum deceives and misrepresents to allege that each time a terrorist is punished others replace him. This kind of terrorism is, alas, the history of the Arabs, from whom we get the word "assassin" from their doping themselves up with hashish for their evil deeds and thus were known as "Hashasheen" (phonetic).

Meachum misrepresents the thrust of his incredibly insensitive writing about the hijacking of the Achille Lauro to pretend that it was that "society has no choice" but to punish ~~them~~^{terrorists}. What he actually did is condemn the efforts to bring them to justice at all, as I then wrote, without response from him. When he cannot be honest in referring to his own recent writing, how can you take his word on anything at all?

Nothing is as simple as he makes it and there is no lie he avoids if he thinks it can make his propagandists point. For example, the use of terror "has very rarely produced the desired end." Throughout history, including the present horror in the middle east, the use of terror has succeeded. The promising efforts for peace there by Abdallah and Sadat were ended by precisely this terror. Heads of state were replaced by it throughout history. Look at Lebanon now, where the incredible fratricide

by Arabs against arabs has succeeded, with Syria, without a word of protest by Meachum, in de facto control for years, its control only now increased.

There is no simple solution, particularly when one side is determined to prevent a solution, as for decades the Arabs have been in the holy land. But there is one thing that history does make clear and that is that capitulation to terror is never a solution.

Save for lip service, having been castigated for his failure to condemn the subhuman murder of the aged and crippled American Jew by the Achille Lauro terrorists (who ^{is} leader Meachum praised and defended), his saying that of course we mourn the murder of Natasha Simpson (without a word of the killing of all those non-Americans and the wounding of more than a hundred others), Meachum has yet, even in no more than lip service, to mention the slaughter of so many innocent Jews by those he defends and for whom he propagandizes.

Yet he takes at face value the word of the just-captured assassin, that he and his fellow murderers were avenging the deaths of Arab children. Why ~~does he then~~^{g Meachum} not take the ~~same~~^{same} word from that source, that he is part of Fatah, headed by Meachum's bedmate Arafat?

Meachum is entitled to his own opinion, as we all are, but there is a real limit to what can be accepted. One may not, for example, cry "Fire!" in a crowded theater, as the Supreme Court held. Meachum is also entitled to parrot what Hitler claimed in the Sudetenland, that it was all his. He is even entitled to steal Chamberlain's umbrella. But after all his earlier incitations to anti-semitism, some less subtle than others but all having the same thrust, is this what you want in your paper? Is this what you want the people of the Frederick area to believe and now to act upon, as in "Washington must hear. This nation's way of life is at stake, as well as American lives."

Another victim of the (again Arab) terrorism Meachum would have your readers believe rarely succeeds is Robert Kennedy. He had a special corruption of Dante that is in point, "A special corner of Hell is reserved for those who in time of moral crisis preserve their equanimity," as you, dear editor, do with Meachum's incitations to anti-semitism. And it is Santayana's wisdom that those of us who forget history are doomed to relive it. Pastor Niemöller also was talking to you, dear editor, when he said that as each class of Hitler's victims was slaughtered he was silent until, when he was led away, there was no one to speak for him. I am trying to charge you with your responsibilities as an editor.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg
Harold Weisberg

Who once assassinated
could not be president.